



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/444,711	11/24/1999	TIMOTHY J. YEATMAN	114205.400	9003

27160 7590 04/23/2002

PATENT ADMINISTRATOR  
KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS  
SUITE 1600  
525 WEST MONROE STREET  
CHICAGO, IL 60661

EXAMINER

HARRIS, ALANA M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1642	16

DATE MAILED: 04/23/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/444,711	YEATMAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	Art Unit	
	Alana M. Harris, Ph.D.	1642	
<b>--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</b>			
<p>THE REPLY FILED 28 March 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.</p>			
<b>PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]</b>			
<p>a) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>b) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).</p>			
<p>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</p>			
<p>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>28 March 2002</u>. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.</p>			
<p>2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:</p>			
<p>(a) <input type="checkbox"/> they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</p>			
<p>(b) <input type="checkbox"/> they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);</p>			
<p>(c) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</p>			
<p>(d) <input type="checkbox"/> they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</p>			
<p>NOTE: _____.</p>			
<p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.</p>			
<p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</p>			
<p>5. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The a)<input type="checkbox"/> affidavit, b)<input type="checkbox"/> exhibit, or c)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>.</p>			
<p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.</p>			
<p>7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> will not be entered or b)<input type="checkbox"/> will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.</p>			
<p>The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</p>			
<p>Claim(s) allowed: _____.</p>			
<p>Claim(s) objected to: _____.</p>			
<p>Claim(s) rejected: <u>29-38</u>.</p>			
<p>Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.</p>			
<p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a)<input type="checkbox"/> approved or b)<input type="checkbox"/> disapproved by the Examiner.</p>			
<p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) ( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.</p>			
<p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</p>			

The proposed amendments to claims 29 and 35 do not obviate the 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph of record. A codon is a set of three adjacent nucleotides that occur in mRNA. Applicants' proposed amendments recite that "the polynucleotide has a codon 531, and wherein the codon 531 is a stop codon". The recitation "531" seems to reference one nucleic acid. These proposed amendments do not aid in clarifying the recitation "codon 531". Furthermore these proposed amendments were not entered because the term "isolated" is misspelled in claim 29. The 102(e) rejection of claims 29-36 and 38 is maintained. Applicants' arguments state that U.S. Patent 5,336,615 (August 9, 1994) is not analogous art because the patent discloses genetically engineered endothelial cells having enhanced migration and enhanced plasminogen activation activity. This argument is not persuasive. Applicants' arguments are not commensurate in scope with the claims. While Applicants' claimed invention involves malignant transformation and metastasis the claims read on a polynucleotide product, which is anticipated by patent '615. As observed in the database sheet received by Applicants with the first action on the merits the claimed polynucleotide is anticipated by the said patent. For the reasons set forth the rejections of record in Paper number 12, mailed January 2, 2002 are maintained.

  
ANTHONY C. CAPUTA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600